

<p style="text-align: center;">RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT</p> <p>Address to: Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450</p>	Docket No.	UCAL-282
	Confirmation No.	2272
	Application No.	10/626,415
	Filing Date	July 23, 2003
	Examiner	K.C. Srivastava
	Group Art Unit	1655
	Title	<i>ApoE stable folding intermediate and methods of use thereof</i>

Sir:

This communication is submitted in response to the Restriction Requirement mailed July 5, 2006. The Restriction Requirement set forth a one-month time period for response, making a response due on or before August 5, 2006. Accordingly, this response is timely filed.

I. REMARKS

In the Restriction Requirement, the Examiner required election of one of the following groups of claims:

- Group I: claims 1-4 and 21;
- Group II: claims 5-11;
- Group III: claims 12-15; and
- Group IV: claims 16-20.

Applicants hereby elect to prosecute the claims of Group I, claims 1-4 and 21, with traverse. As stated in the MPEP §803, if search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine the entire application on the merits, even though the entire application includes claims to independent or distinct inventions. It is Applicants' position that it would not be unduly burdensome to perform a search on all of the claims together in the present application. Accordingly, Applicants traverse the restriction requirement.